

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 14, 16-19, 23-25, 27 and 28 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 14-19, 22-25, 27 and 28 are rejected. Claims 15 and 22 are cancelled herein. Claims 4-13, 20, 21 and 26 are previously cancelled. Claims 1, 16, 17, 23 and 27 are amended herein to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicants herein traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 15, 22 and 23 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention as a result of informalities stated in the Office Action. The claims are amended to remove or correct the informalities noted in the Office Action. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 15, 22 and 23 and their allowance are earnestly requested.

Claims 1, 2, 14-18, 22, 23 and 27 are rejected as obvious over German Reference DE 198 49 266 (DE '266) in view of Japanese Reference JP 4-97064 (JP '064) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 15 and 22 are cancelled herein, rendering their rejection moot. The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection as pertaining to the remaining claims. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be

sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Independent claims 1 and 17 are amended to incorporate the general limitations of claim 15, and requires that a grid support comprised of lower booms includes a lower boom having the insulating coating, the lower boom being disposed at a different height position from other ones of the lower booms, as illustrated, by example, in Fig. 3C of the present application. As explained in the specification (paragraph [0018] of the published application) such configuration allows the longitudinal rods to “then rest on the shallower lower boom without contact being formed between them, and in addition the longitudinal rods are also isolated from the same lower booms, which have a normal height.”

The DE ‘266 reference simply depicts a conventional carriage braced girder, at which the lower booms all exhibit the same height level. In alleged support for his position, the Examiner points to the longitudinal reinforcement beams 8 disclosed in the cited reference, which are alleged as exhibiting another height level than the lateral reinforcement beams 9. This, however, is different from the structure in accordance with the incorporated subject matter of claim 15, since therein it is stated that the lower boom that includes the isolating coating is disposed at another height level than the other lower booms. Thus, the lower boom of the claimed invention can be said to correspond with the longitudinal reinforcement beams 8 cited in the DE ‘266 reference (not transverse rods, as claimed). However, even if these longitudinal

reinforcement beams are so equated, they are nevertheless all situated at the same height level. Thus, one skilled in the art reading DE '266, would be lead to place all of the lower booms (whether transverse or longitudinal) at the same height level, as for instance is shown in Fig. 1 of DE '266.

Applicants respectfully submit that the secondary JP '064 reference fails to adequately supplement the deficiencies noted above with regard to DE '266.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 14-18, 22, 23 and 27 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 19, 24, 25 and 28 are rejected as obvious over German Reference DE 198 49 266 in view of Japanese Reference JP 4-97064, and further in view of Padrun (US 4,617,775) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

Padrun, cited merely for its use of plastic clips 13, 14 to allegedly provide overlapping connection of reinforcing bars, fails to provide the teaching lacking in the combination of DE '22 and JP '064, as discussed above.

Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 3, 19, 24, 25 and 28 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due. If there is any fee due the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants
and,

By Lawrence I. Wechsler
Lawrence I. Wechsler
Reg. No. 36,049
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340